to its preparation. No crisis is shown in this tragedy. "The crisis for Antony had come before the opening of the play. His meeting Cleopatra was his doom. The desertion of Octavia and the Battle of Actium are but incidents, as all other scenes of the play are but incidents, of the great catastrophe. . . . The whole tragedy of Antony, like that of Lear, is a falling action." The critics who contend that the play lacks unity are said to be triflers. On an Elizabethan stage the change of scene would scarcely have been noticeable. And, if the spiritual action be considered it will be found that there are only two places in the world that make any difference to Antony—in Cleopatra's presence, or out. The character-unity, moreover, is absolute. There is one all-pervading presence—Antony's Cleopatra. *Antony and Cleopatra* is a drama of spectacle emphasizing a philosophical idea and closing in a tremendous catastrophe.

"Coriolanus" is in effect a summary of Shakespeare's tragic structure and an advance in philosophy. "The action is evenly balanced and regularly developed. It presents a double material rise and fall, with a continued spiritual misadjustment. In other words, it presents two catastrophes closely bound together and explained by a prolonged causal catastrophe." Coriolanus fails twice over; his first catastrophe results from his inability to restrain his spirit, and his second, from his persistent indulgence of that spirit in a strange use of military prowess. Act III presents the first catastrophe—the entire break with the Romans. Coriolanus fails to do what he set out to do, namely, to humble himself before his countrymen. He is, therefore, banished. The second catastrophe—the death of Coriolanus—is causally connected with the first. Both are the result of the protagonist's temperament. The material action rises to the first catastrophe; then rises again to the second; but the spiritual action falls from the beginning. Coriolanus is out of harmony with his times. Each opportunity shows more clearly his unfitness to lead the Roman people. There is no crisis-deed; the crisis "is the reciprocal destructiveness of disposition and opportunity." "The play is a tragedy of spirit and represents the catastrophe inherent in the way of doing things and omitting to do things. . . . Eventuation of character into failure is the action of the *Coriolanus* tragedy."

C. V. BOYER.

University of Illinois.

VON KÄDMON BIS KYNEWULF, eine litterarhistorische Studie von Gregor Sarrazin. Berlin, Mayer und Müller, 1913.

In this volume Professor Sarrazin attempts a reconstruction, a literary-historical synthesis of Old English literature, for, he says, too much of modern criticism has been devoted to analysis, to

"*Kleinliederjägerei.*" The tests on which such a reconstruction should depend, he classifies as (1) metrical-grammatical, (2) syntactical, (3) lexicographical, (4) stylistic, and (5) literary-historical. The individual tests on which he lays greatest stress are the presence of uncontracted forms, and the occurrence of archaic words and forms.

The general plan of the book is indicated by the chapter headings: I *Kädmon*; II *Kädmons Nachfolger (Daniel, Exodus)*; III *Spüren und Reste der Heldendichtung (Widsith, Beowulf)*; IV *Die Exeter-Rätsel und das Traumgesicht vom Kreuze*; V *Guthlac, der Einseidler und der sogenannte "Christ."*

The two chapters devoted to the Caedmonian poems are in the main but a restatement and elaboration of the views which the author set forth in *Englische Studien* (vol. 38, p. 170 ff.), as they have been substantiated by the researches of Richter and Klaeber. Here, however, he has analyzed the language of *Exodus* and *Daniel* in much greater detail than in the earlier article. He upholds his original contention that *Daniel* is earlier than *Beowulf*—Richter, it will be remembered, left the date undecided—an opinion that has since been corroborated by Professor P. G. Thomas (*M. L. R.* vol. 8 (1913), pp. 537-539). The new contributions to the study of *Genesis A* are made to prove the early date of the poem and so to strengthen his theory that it was the work of Caedmon. As regards the language the most important additions are (1) an analysis of the first thousand lines on the basis of the Lichtenheld tests, and (2) a re-examination and denial of Richter's statement that in *Genesis* we have more examples of two-syllabled forms of words originally of one syllable, than we have in *Beowulf*. And as regards the authorship he agrees with Professor Blackburn in his recent edition of *Exodus* and *Daniel*, that Bede's account of the Caedmonian poems does not necessarily mean that they were all short lyrics. He finds additional evidence of Caedmon's authorship in the character and the use of the poem's sources. There is great inaccuracy in the forms of proper names; the sources had not, so far as is known, been brought together in any one commentary; moreover, they were partly heretical, partly orthodox, in teaching. Such evidence argues for, rather than against, the theory that the poem was the work of a layman who had received only verbal instruction from the learned men of the monastery. This argument seems sound; moreover, it agrees with the theory I like to hold; it was, therefore, disappointing to find that, in one point at least, Professor Sarrazin had been very careless in his use of material. The only bit of heresy he points out has to do with the so-called Gregorian teaching about the fall of the angels, which, he says, may in the last analysis be ascribed to Origen. But the passage cited in confirmation (Loofs' *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, Halle, 1906, pp. 197-98) does not refer to the account of the fall found in *Genesis*.

"Zur Strafe und zur Läuterung der Gefallenen hat dann Gott in seiner Gerechtigkeit und Güte - - - - die vergängliche materie und aus ihr diese sichtbare Welt mit ihren himmlischen, irdischen und unterirdischen Regionen geschaffen und die gefallenen Geister je nach dem Mass ihrer Sünde in verschiedenartige *materielle* Leiber inkorporiert, - - - - Die wenigst gefallenen Geister sind die Engel . . . ; sie haben Körper feinster Bildung. Auch die Gestirne gehören zu ihnen. Die am tiefsten gefallenen, die Dämonen, der Teufel . ., . und seine Engelordnungen, die in der Luft hausen, haben minder lichte ätherische Körper erhalten. Zwischen beiden stehen die Menschen" (*l. c.* pp. 197-98).

Yet, according to Professor Sarrazin's own statement (p. 23) it was this teaching and not that which actually appears in the *Genesis* that was declared heretical by the Synod at Constantinople in 543.

In discussing *Widsith* Professor Sarrazin touches on only those points in which his interpretation differs from that of Chambers (*Widsith, a Study in Old English Heroic Legend,* Cambridge, 1912). Most important is his contention that we have in the poet Widsith, though the name is obviously a typical one, a historical personage, a contemporary of Aelfwine (Alboin) in the sixth century. The anachronism in the reference to the poet's visit to the court of Ermanaric (Eormanric) (d. *c.* 375) he explains as due to confusion with Irminric, king of the Jutes, father of King Aethelberht, who died *c.* 560; later the little known king of the Jutes (*Geotena cyning*) was confused with the famous king of the Goths (*Gotena cyning*). This hypothesis explains better than any other the poet's inconsistency in praising Eormanric's liberality and at the same time referring to him as *wraþ waerloga* (l. 9), as well as the statement that he came to the court of Eormanric *eastan, of Ongle* (l. 8). The exact position of Ealhhild, however, Professor Sarrazin leaves in doubt. He rejects the suggestion of Heinzel, accepted and elaborated by Chambers (p. 21 ff.), that Ealhhild is identical with Swanhild, the cruelly murdered wife of Eormanric, and in one paragraph seems to accept the old view that she was the wife of Eadgils, saying that the poet *an den Hof des Königs Irminric nach England kam, in dem Diener des Myrgingenfürsten Eadgils und der Fürstin Ealhhild, der Schwester Alboins* (p. 58). But in the following paragraph he says it makes no difference whether she were married to Eormanric or not (*Ob Ealhhild wirklich mit jenem Eormanric vermählt war, ist nicht zu ermitteln und kann dahingestellt bleiben,* p. 59). The question, however, is too important to be dismissed thus summarily, and Chambers has made it very unlikely that Ealhhild was other than the wife of Eormanric (pp. 23-28). Moreover, if, as Sarrazin states, the Anglo-Saxons learned this song from the poet when he visited the court of Irminric in England, how could he have told them of the events that did not take place until he returned to his own home (ll. 93-96)?

In the chapter on *Beowulf* Professor Sarrazin holds to his well-known belief in a Danish origin. He does not, however, believe now, as he did formerly, that the Old English poem is a mere translation of an Ur-Danish epic; instead, he accepts the theory

of Müllenhoff that it came to the Anglo-Saxons through a Frisian singer, who added the Hygelac and Finn episodes. But in the light of the facts brought together by Professor Chadwick in the early chapters of his volume on the heroic age (*The Heroic Age*, Cambridge, 1912) any discussion of the *Beowulf*—or for that matter of the *Widsith*—as a single poem quite apart from the other poems of that age, needs at least to be revised. And in view of the very slight knowledge we have of the English tribes before the middle of the sixth century it is hardly fair to say that the poem could not have been composed in England. For since many of the historic personages in it belong to the sixth century, the epic could not have been composed before the middle of the century, and migration had ceased long before that time (Cf. Chadwick *l. c.* p. 51 ff. Compare, also, Stjerna's *Essays on Questions connected with the Old English Poem of Beowulf*, translated by John R. Clark Hall, 1912). Again, in his statements about the relationship between the hero, Beowulf, and Bǫðvar-Bjarki of Scandinavian tradition, Professor Sarrazin might have profited by consulting the recent researches of Professor Chadwick (*l. c.* p. 119 ff.) and more especially, those of Miss Clarke (*Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period*, "Girton College Studies" No. III, Cambridge, 1911, pp. 44-57). For if, as Miss Clarke believes, Beowulf was a historic character corresponding to Bǫðvar-Bjarki, is the assumption that the Old English poet must have known an Ur-Danish saga necessary?

The remaining chapters center about the figure of Cynewulf. Professor Sarrazin's conclusions, stated briefly, are as follows: *The Exeter Riddles, Beowulf*, and *The Dream of the Rood* were composed by Cynewulf; *Guthlac A* and *B* were the work of some poet who, if not Cynewulf himself, was very much like him; *Christ* I and III were originally the work of another poet, but they owe their present form to Cynewulf.

The whole question of Cynewulf's connection with the poems is, as Professor Sarrazin says, one not of names but of poetic personality, and as such, it is not to be argued, depending, as it does, on the individual's perception of that personality. The inherent probabilities of the case, however, are against his conclusion. Are we to believe that Cynewulf lived and worked alone, practically without poetic contemporaries? Or, are we to believe that from a school of poets, the divine chance that has ruled over the preservation of our Old English manuscripts, had marked partiality for Cynewulf?

To convince the doubter, however, Professor Sarrazin gives lists of resemblances in phraseology, grammatical usage, vocabulary, meter, and style. These do not seem to me to be sufficiently great to warrant the assumption of common authorship. If, for instance, there is influence of the riddle form on *The Dream of The Rood*, it is not great. And the explanation of the Scyld story in *Beowulf*

as a riddle, in which the king who came from the unknown and returned to the unknown betokens the sun, is to my mind *ipso facto* ridiculous, quite apart from the recent identification of Scyld with the Skjold of Scandinavian tradition (Chadwick, *The Origin of the English Nation*, "King Aethelwulf's Mythical Ancestors." An abstract of Professor Chadwick's argument was made by Miss Clarke, *l. c.* pp. 122-30. For the religious belief involved in the story see the essay on "Scyld's Funeral Obsequies" in Stjerna's *Essays on Beowulf*). Moreover, many of Professor Sarrazin's resemblances, depend upon the presence of motives that are characteristic of Old English poetry as a whole, such as the love of gold and silver, the emphasis on the pleasures of this world, the feeling of melancholy, and the fidelity of a man to his lord. He makes much, too, of the presence of aristocratic or courtly traditions in poems which, if not written by monks, show a distinctly religious bias. In fact his entire argument about Cynewulf depends on the minstrel theory, which he asserts as confidently as though it had never been doubted (cf. Carleton Brown, "The Autobiographical Element in the Cynewulfian Rune Passages," *Englische Studien*, vol. 38 (1907), pp. 196-233).

The actual value of the present volume, taken as a whole, is doubtful. The conclusions on strictly philological questions are sound and trustworthy; but as I have tried to show, Professor Sarrazin is not well acquainted with recent publications which deal with literary or historical aspects of the questions; he is not always exact; and he is apt to let the desire to prove a pet theory run away with his better judgment. Moreover, the value of the book is greatly lessened by the fact that Professor Sarrazin is not always careful to state when his discussions and conclusions are being set forth for the first time, and when they are mere restatements of conclusions published at some earlier date. As a result the veteran has to read through a great mass of material with which he is already familiar, while the recruit is constantly being puzzled by learning that conclusions which he had heralded as startlingly new and original, may be found in the author's earlier writings. And in any case the business of separating the old from the new requires an unnecessary waste of time and energy—a waste at which philologists, burdened as they are by an ever increasing mass of technical reading-matter, may not unpardonably grumble.

<div align="right">LOUISE DUDLEY.</div>

Lawrence College.

JACK JUGGLER, edited by W. H. Williams, M.A., Cambridge at the University Press, 1914.

We can never have too many good editions of our early English drama. Of this kind of attention the interlude of *Jack Juggler* has